For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

Ex libris
universitatis
albertaensis

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
QUAECUMQUE VERA

THESIS

"THE DIVORCEMENT OF MAGIC FROM RELIGION"

or more fully

"THE ELIMINATING OF MAGIC FROM RELIGION BY ISRAEL'S PROPHETS, WITH SPECIAL ATTENTION TO THE PSYCHOLOGY INVOLVED."

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to the B.D. Committee of the

Senate of the University of Alberta

In candidacy for the degree of

Bachelor of Divinity

by

Emanuel J. Heuer, B.A.,

University of Alberta

April 11, 1936.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2018 with funding from
University of Alberta Libraries

https://archive.org/details/divorcementofmag00eman

CONTENTS

The Definition of Magic.

The Definition of Religion.

Magic and Religion in Babylonia.

Magic and Religion in Egypt.

Magic and Religion in Israel Before the Eighth Century Prophets.

The Religion of the Eighth Century Prophets.

Magic and Religion during the Exilic and Post-exilic Periods.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Brown, Driver and Briggs	"Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament."
Caird, Edward	"The Evolution of Religion."
Coe, G.A.	"Psychology of Religion."
Hadfield, J.A.	"Psychology and Morals."
Harper, W.R.	"International Critical Commentary--Amos."
Lang, Andrew	"Magic and Religion."
Moffatt, James	"The Holy Bible, a New Translation."
Oesterly and Robinson	"Hebrew Religion."
Povah J.W.	"The New Psychology and the Hebrew Prophets."
Smith J.M.P.	"The Origin and History of Hebrew Law."
	"The Prophets and their Times."
Smith, W.R.	"Religion of the Semites."
Wright, W.K.	"A Student's Philosophy of Religion."

The Abingdon Commentary

Encyclopaedia Brittanica.

Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics.

Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible.

THE DEFINITION OF MAGIC

Belief in magic is found everywhere, from the dawn of human consciousness to modern enlightenment, from primitive man to the scholar of today. The magical practices and beliefs of today may appear to have no connection with the magic of the past because of our clever rationalizations and interpretations; but it cannot be denied that many of our beliefs, and often our highest beliefs,[1] both in the secular and religious spheres, have their roots in primitive magic. This development of magic through human history, together with the fact that among the various groups of primitive people magical beliefs and practices were so different, places many obstacles in the way of an attempt to define it. So many conflicting theories have been advocated by men who have thoroughly studied the subject that a tyro hesitates to define.

Perhaps it would be wise to begin with several definitions as they are found in various articles on magic. The Encyclopaedia Brittanica[2] gives the following: "Magic is the practice of maleficent arts which involve the use of magico-religious power with perhaps a secondary idea of the use of private arts, which are to benefit, not the community as a whole, but a single

(1) G.A. Coe, "Psychology of Religion." p.90
(2) Eleventh Edition, Vol. 17 p.306

individual." As it stands this definition is somewhat incomplete which incompleteness is however made good in the remainder of the article on "Magic." To complete this definition it is necessary to explain what is meant by magico-religious power.

An example will be the best explanation. This magico-religious power is like the belief in Mana found among the Melanesians. To quote again from the same article this Mana "is a force, an action, a quality, or a state; it is transmissible and contagious, and hence is associated with taboo; it may be regarded as material and seen in the form of flames or heard; it is the power which is inherent in certain spirits,---it may also be a force inherent in some inanimate object such as a stone which causes yams to grow. But it is a spiritual force and does not act mechanically; it is the power of the magicians and of the rite, the magic formula itself is 'mana.'"(1) This same "mana" is also the secret of a warrior's bravery as well as an animal's courage. This partially explains why a South African warrior, for example, may not eat hedgehog, because the animal is thought to be cowardly and the eater would himself become a coward; on the other hand the flesh of lions is fit meat for brave men because they at the same time transfer its courage to themselves.

(1) Encyclopaedia Brittanica, XI Ed. Article "Magic."

Another fact which should be mentioned in a definition of magic is that "magic is sometimes made to depend upon the activity of **demons and spirits,"**[1] or as Owen C. Whitehouse words it,[2] "Magic rests on the basis of a belief in evil and destructive spirits, to whose baleful influences man is daily exposed, and which can be counteracted by certain incantations, whereby the countervailing name and power of the higher beneficent gods are invoked." Magicians are often, though not always, believed to have an animal helper the assistance of which is obtained by going into a trance.[3] The use of names is also a factor in magical practices. Human beings and even spirits may be coerced by the use of their names, hence names of the dead are forbidden lest the bare mention of them disturb their ghosts and also for the same reason the names of the gods are often kept secret. Whitehouse[4] gives the following description: "Magic may, in its historic sense, be best described as the special and abnormal agency, whether through words or acts, whereby certain superhuman personal powers are constrained either to create evil (or good) or to avert baleful effects."

The definition of magic to be used in this paper

(1) Encyclopaedia Brittanica "Magic."
(2) Owen C. Whitehouse, Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible Vol. I p. 591
(3) Ency. Brit. "Magic."
(4) Whitehouse, Hasting's Vol. III p. 207a

employs in part the terminology of the above two definitions. Magic is the practice of maleficent or beneficient arts, using either objects, words, or acts, or all together in accordance with certain formulae and ritual, which are believed to bring under control all-pervasive, impersonal, supernatural powers, either to create evil or good for an individual, or a group, or to avert baleful effects imposed upon individuals or groups by demons or spirits at the instigation of another magician, witch, or sorcerer. Or, in other words, magic is fundamentally an approach or attitude toward a power other and greater than man in which mysterious and impersonal methods of control are sought or employed.

Magic had its beginning with primitive man. He was surrounded by many phenomena which he could not explain, yet which so directly influenced his life that he had to learn to live with them as best he could. In thus seeking to live with these phenomena he developed that art which we call magic. This practice of magic involves the belief in the operation of certain laws. It demands certain conditions. Chief among these laws lying at the base of magical practice is that of sympathy.(1) It is, however, improbable that primitive man began with the law of sympathy. He probably began with concrete instances and arrived little by little at abstract ideas of magical

(1) Ency. Brit. "Magic."

power. For example, disease and death, were a mystery to early man. He could detect no difference between a man stretched out helpless in a hut and the warrior who marched about the village, except that the former was incapable of walking. Nor could he see any difference between a dead man and a living man except that the former was completely quiet and still. Such things, he argued, must be caused by demons and spirits and from this basic belief he developed such a complicated system of magic as almost to defy definition.

This law of sympathy takes one of three forms, either contiguity, homoeopathy, or contrariety or antipathy.

The law of sympathetic contiguity is based upon the belief that a part of the body such as hair or finger-nail parings, or merely something which has been in contact with the body such as clothing or an arrow, continues to be as one with the body. Thus by burning hair or finger-nail parings or clothing (1) the body of the person to whom these belonged or were in contact with, is injured. There is a practice among the Melanesians, when an arrow is found, of placing it either among cool leaves or among hot ashes depending upon whether it had wounded a friend or a foe thereby causing the wound either to soothe and heal or to become inflamed. Other primitive peoples drive nails

(1) See Whitehouse, Hasting's Vol. IV p. 602b.

into a footprint thinking thereby to injure the foot which had made the print.

The practice of homeopathy is based on the sympathetic law that like produces like. A good example of this is the burning of the wax likness or image of a certain person in order to bring evil upon that person. Another form of this law is the subtracting of certain body fluids from the sick believing thereby to remove disease.

In certain respects the third form of the law of sympathy, namely contrariety or antipathy is at work in the above two forms. This third form is based on the assumption that a remedy produces the contrary when it cures the like. Also, like by producing like expels its contrary.

The above mentioned laws consist chiefly in acts but there is always a certain amount of ritual connected with them. As already indicated names play a very important part in magic, their efficiency being dependent upon the law of sympathy. Deities are thereby invoked to cast or to remove spells. The following is an example from Babylonian exorcism:

"But I by the command of Marduk lord of charms,
By Marduk the master of bewitchment,
Both the male and female sorcerer,
As with ropes I will entwine,
As in a bird's snare I will catch,

As in a net I will overpower,

As in a noose I will throttle,

As a fabric I will tear."

The magician is not an impostor. Psychology teaches us that even among modern people there is a marked tendency to forget the unpleasant. We easily forget those instances when a "pet" theory of ours fails, but we always remember the occasions when it succeeds and from the latter occasions we draw our conclusions. The same would be true of the savage, for human nature, in this sense, has changed very little, if at all. He would still believe in the law of sympathy in spite of its failures, for these failures would be simply disregarded or explained away. Andrew Lang (1) says, "The Australians, when their magic fails, merely say some other black fellow is working stronger counter magic." Thus the magician could always escape by unconscious rationalization. It would be unjust to accuse him of pure invention of these explanations. On the other hand, he would take note of every instance in which his magic was successful. These instances would in time give him the proper ritual to be followed in certain cases. He would continue his practice with a wholehearted belief in the ritual and in himself as a magician.

Freud (2) explains the psychology of magic as follows:

(1) Andrew Lang, "Magic and Religion" p.56
(2) Freud, "Totem and Taboo," English.

"Since similarity and contiguity are the two essential principles of the processes of association of ideas, it must be concluded that the dominance of association of ideas really explains all the madness of the rules of magic. We can see how true Tylor's quoted characteristic of magic: 'mistaking an ideal connection for a real one,' proves to be. The same may be said of Frazer's idea, who expressed it in almost the same terms: 'men mistook the order of their ideas for the order of nature, and hence imagined that the control which they have, or seem to have, over their thoughts, permitted them to have a corresponding control over things.' But on closer consideration we must sustain the objection that the association theory of magic merely explains the paths that magic travels, and not its essential nature, that is, it does not explain the misunderstanding which bids it put psychological laws in place of natural ones. We are apparently in need here of a dynamic factor." This dynamic factor Freud finds in primitive man's wishes. "The motives which impel one to exercise magic are easily recognized; they are the wishes of men. We need only assume that primitive man had great confidence in the power of his wishes. At the bottom everything which he accomplished by magic means must have been done solely because he wanted it. Thus in the beginning only his wish is accentuated." Again---"The principle which controls magis is ----------'Omnipotence

of thought.'"[1]

Because magic may be both beneficent and maleficent it falls naturally into two parts "We have to do with the art with which the Babylonian systems make us familiar, whereby the superior deities or good demons are influenced to exercise their good offices to avert evil, i.e. whereby counterspells or charms are worked. This art may be called 'sacred magic.' On the other hand, we have to do with the Black art called sorcery whereby evils are wrought on the unfortunate human victim through the power of the evil eye, etc., by the male sorcerer, or more frequently through the female witch who is able to summon supernatural powers of darkness to his or her aid."[2]

Demonology is connected with magic in two ways. First, as stated above, magic is sometimes made to depend on the activity of demons and spirits and second, the magician usually has a spirit helper (generally an animal); but magical powers are not limited to those who are so aided.

"Magic is an attempt to influence the course of events, divination to foresee them; but divination is frequently regarded as magical."[3] The magical content of divination lies in its frequent attempt to force the powers that be to reveal coming events and at times to

(1) Above quotation was taken from J.W. Povah, "The New Psych. and the Hebrew Prophets." p. 27 (footnote.)
(2) Whitehouse, Hasting's Vol. III p. 207a
(3) Ency. Brit. "Magic."

force them to bring certain events to pass. In the Old Testament Balak believed Balaam could thus force events.

"Soothsaying, though separate from magic is nevertheless closely associated with it. It may be defined as involving an abnormal mode of obtaining knowledge."[1]

(1) Whitehouse, Hasting's Vol. IV p. 598a.

THE DEFINITION OF RELIGION

A definition of religion is even more difficult than a definition of magic. First, because we must seek to describe something which lies primarily within man by making use of such outward manifestations as enter our observation. Again, it is almost impossible to approach such a definition with a purely disinterested attitude. The temptation is to make the definition suit one's personal religion in such a manner that the latter may in no way be discredited or lowered. The tendency is to give one's own valuation rather than a definition. However, one must earnestly seek that historic imagination which will enable him to forget for the moment the high plane which religion today has reached and to live in the period being studied.

There are many definitions of religion and the method to arrive at a definition to be used in this paper will be similar to that used in arriving at a definition of magic.

Coe in his Psychology of Religion[1] takes objection to any definition involving the term "belief" but this objection has little point for us because we are dealing with religions which involve belief. Also, strictly primitive[2] religion lies outside the scope of this

(1) Coe, "Psych. Rel." p.59f
(2) e.g. Fetishism, totemism, etc.

paper. Coe defines religion in terms of social values and their conservation. He quotes Ames, "Religion is the Consciousness of the highest social values,"[1] and Wright, "Religion is the endeavor to secure conservation of socially recognized values."[2] The latter definition is much more true of Israel's priests than it is of its prophets. The prophets had a forward-look not recognized by the above definition. Coe's definition may be quoted if only for the sake that it drives home the fact that religion is something progressive rather than static as indicated by the thought of conservation of values. He says,[3] "We must think of religion as an immanent movement within our values, a movement which does not terminate in any simple set of thought contents, or in any set of particular values." Although this definition may be somewhat advanced beyond the period being dealt with it makes clear that any definition of religion must allow for progress. As Coe says elsewhere,[4] "Religion asks, 'What would satisfy the reciprocal good-will of men toward one another?' and as a result it finds itself in the profoundest discontent with things as they are." This is very true of Israel's eighth century prophets. It is, however, not a priestly idea.

Wright's[5] definition is similar to Coe's. "Religion

(1) Coe, "Psych. Rel." p.71
(2) ibid. p. 62
(3) ibid. p. 72
(4) ibid. p. 240
(5) W.K. Wright, "A Student's Phil. of Rel." p.47

is the endeavor to secure the conservation of socially recognized values through specific actions that are believed to evoke some agency different from the ordinary ego of the individual, or from other merely human beings, and that imply a feeling of dependence upon this agency." Giving some of the terms in this definition a broad meaning it is quite applicable to both early and late religion. Thus "conservation" includes quantitative increase of material goods and also enhancement or intensification of the values, such as bravery, loyalty, etc. Under "agency" he includes the idea of "mana".

Leuba says,[1] "Religion is that part of human experience in which man feels himself in relation with powers of psychic[2] nature, usually personal powers and makes use of them." Frazer[3] defines religion as "a propitiation or conciliation of powers (conscious or personal agents) superior to man which are believed to direct and control the course of nature and of human life."

The propitiation however, must be regarded as personal and not as purely ritualistic. By saying the propitiation must be personal is meant that it must be similar in nature to the methods employed in the relationships

(1) Coe, "Psych. Rel." p. 63
(2) i.e. spiritual.
(3) J.G. Frazer, "The Golden Bough" 2nd edition I, 63 (Quoted from Ency. Brit.)

between men. That is, the worshipper must seek the deity's favor by pleasing him, by being obedient to his commands and by giving him his due honor just as a loyal subject seeks the favor of his sovereign. Any ritual used in this propitiation must be designed to think of the relationship with the deity as personal. As soon as it fails to do so it immediately drops into the sphere of magic. One may add, however, that this does not mean that the deity must be conceived of as moral. He may be regarded as unmoral, even as immoral and yet be approachable by personal propitiation.

In conversation with Dr. A.S. Tuttle religion was defined somewhat as follows: "Religion is the recognition of some power outside, greater than and beyond man and the attempt to establish a friendly and helpful relationship with that power with a view to harmonize life and to secure the strength which enables man to do what he cannot do by himself and to find in that relationship the bond of unity and harmonious fellowship among men." In primitive times it was religion conceived of as a blood relationship to the deity which held the tribes together.

From the above definitions and information the following is put forth as the definition of religion to be used in this paper. Religion involves the recognition of a superhuman power (or powers), originally conceived of as impersonal, but within the whole period covered by this

paper regarded as personal, and the attempt to establish an ever more friendly relationship with this power chiefly by means of obedience and propitiation that it may be induced to do for man what he cannot do for himself, and, in the view of the prophets, that he may progressively rise to high social values.

A few comments may be necessary. The phrase "originally conceived of as impersonal" is intended to convey the idea that in later times this power was regarded as personal. The thought of progress is contained in the words "an ever more friendly relationship." Man cannot do everything for himself and this gives him a feeling of dependence upon something beyond himself. In natural religions his chief concern is for concrete, material, practical things such as food, water, protection from storms, victory in war, posterity, counsel as to what to do in important crisis in human affairs. In the ethical religion advocated by the eighth century prophets the emphasis is on justice, goodness, honesty, fairness and other similar virtues. Only when religion becomes an individual matter, as with Jeremiah, does man concern himself with purity of heart, forgiveness of sins, and other such virtues of an inner spiritual nature.(1) Also, religious practices are of a social nature, binding man

(1) Wright, "Student's Phil. of Rel." pp. 41 - 42.

ever closer together and constantly enlarging their scope to embrace, not only the tribe or the nation, but all mankind. Herein lies one of the distinctions between magic and religion. The former emphasizes the individualistic and is at times anti-social while the latter is generally social and seeks the welfare of the group.

A shorter definition of religion may be added. Religion is a personal approach or attitude toward a power other and greater than ourselves with a view to establish helpful and harmonious relationship with that power.

THE DIFFERENTIATION OF MAGIC FROM RELIGION

That magic and religion are very closely related cannot be denied. Many of the practices found in magic are found also in religion. In defining and describing either magic or religion one must constantly use terms and phrases applicable to both. Thus Owen C. Whitehouse says, "Magic is a term used by us to connote a certain range of acts standing in very close relation to ancient religion, yet hardly forming a normal or essential part of it."[1] The Encyclopaedia Brittanica[2] places a part of the cause of this difficulty to distinguish magic from religion in the tendency of primitive psychology to anthropomorphize and personify animals and objects.

Fetishism is recognized as a primitive form of religion, but it is notable how well the characteristics of magic fit into a description of it. "For the essential point of what is called fetishism, if we use that name for any general phenomenon of religion, is just this, that the worshipper has no thought of really devoting himself to ends which are represented as belonging to his god, but desires only, by propitiation, if propitiation is necessary, by magic if magic will avail either, in other words, by begging and bribing or by fraud and force --- to use the god for his own purposes. In this sense

(1) Hasting's Vol. III p. 206b
(2) Article "Magic".

the spirit of fetishism is the dark shadow which accompanies religion in every stage, from the savage who makes presents to the medicine man of his tribe up to the Christian, who prays, not that God's will may be done but that God may be got to do his will."(1)

Thus it is clear that magic and religion have much in common. The idea of "mana" is found in both religion and magic. Prayer, like magic, often seeks to control the deity, rather than persuade, to force him to protect the worshipper from all sorts of evil. Prayers spoken with one's eyes open or in a posture other than one of those accepted by the worshippers or omitting the name of Jesus are regarded as ineffectual. This idea is entirely in accord with the magical belief that the minute correctness of the appeal or ritual counts and not the motive for the appeal. Baptism even today is believed by many to have magical content (but it is for the most part an unconscious belief.) Multitudes wear amulets upon a cord around the neck to invoke a particular saint, to protect the wearer from harm. However, it should be noted that official religion condemns magic and its practices. "You shall not allow any sorceress to live."(2) Then too traffic with the gods of conquered people is by the conquerors condemned as diabolical magic.

There must, however, be differences between magic

(1) Edward Caird,"Evolution of Rel." Vol. 1 p. 225
(2) Ex. 22:18

and religion. Coe[1] says, "As to the relation of magic to religion, three positions have been held. Frazer[2] at one time was of the opinion (subsequently modified) that religion arose because magic, which preceeded it, did not work. Leuba[3] contends at great length that magic and religion are separate in origin and in inner principle; the mark of magic being control of hidden powers; that of religion persuasion of psychic beings. King[4] holds that, though religion and magic have a common root, magic is or tends to be, an individual, non-social, and often anti-social use of the same sort of powers that religion employs."

Thus it is clear, there are genuine and profound differences between magic and religion, first: "Religion organizes life's values and seeks them socially; magic fixes upon any particular value and seeks it individually, or at least independently of the larger social order. Because it lacks the social quality of religion, magic magnifies wonders, and glories in supposed events and connections that lack moral significance." Coe[5] is over-emphasizing the distinction on social grounds. The line of distinction cannot be drawn hard and fast on this basis. Even religion at times is anti-social, and magic is often

(1) Coe, "Psych. Rel." p. 89
(2) Frazer, "Golden Bough."
(3) "A Psych. Study of Rel." Part II
(4) Irving King "Development of Rel." Ch. VII
(5) Coe, "Psych. Rel." p. 91

used for the advantage of a group.

The second distinction is this, many of the magical practices are entirely inexplicable, while religious practices are generally explicable. The believer in magic does not know and could not possibly explain why he changes his course on seeing a black cat in front of him or why he refuses to walk under a ladder. He may have rationalizations but no knowledge regarding the origin of and the reason for these practices. On the other hand the follower of religion has an explanation. His practices have a purpose. He partakes of the Lord's Supper to be drawn nearer to God, to commune with him. He may partake of it simply because God commanded him to do so (but in doing so he communes with God in a personal way) which fact places it immediately in the realm of religion. There are, however, those who feel that something unexplainable is done for them when they eat the consecrated bread and drink the wine. Thus their action is magical. They cannot say what is done for them nor how it is done. This indicates that in order to be certain in our distinctions we must know the mind of the worshipper as well as the ritual he practises.

Then third, as Coe also indicates, religion seeks the assistance of the superhuman power or deity, as the case may be, by pleasing the power or deity as one person seeks to please another. Noah's sacrifice was a

personal propitiation which greatly pleased the deity. He "smelled the soothing fragrance"[1] and immediately promised never again to permit another deluge. Magic, on the other hand, seeks to force, to coerce, to control the existing powers to act according to the will of the magician. This is well illustrated in the story of Balak and Balaam. The former believed in magic, thinking that all that was necessary was to curse the people whom he wished to harm. The latter believed in religion. He insisted on first determining the will of the deity (there is, however, magic in his method of doing this) because he did not believe it possible to successfully apply force. This comparison of force with propitiation affords a very notable and practical distinction between magic and religion. Here again the difficulty is to know the thought of the performer. It is often impossible to say whether or not the intention is to force the power or deity, when the worshipper's mind is not indicated.

The above distinction is really that of the impersonal and personal approach. Magic approaches the deity in an entirely impersonal way. The ritual must be correct. The slightest slip may cause failure or even the counter effect. The motive of the person does not count. Nor does he employ any of the methods in his

(1) Gen. 8:21.

approach that he employs in normal life with his fellows. But religion does use these approaches from normal life even in its ritual and eventually it was thereby enabled in its noblest conceptions to dispense with ritual entirely.

The distinction between divination and the prophetic revelation of the future is also easily drawn. The ideas of force and of entreaty must be applied. Divination is magical in that it seeks to force the powers that be to reveal the future by using sacred lots, oil on water, entrails of animals, flight of birds, and other such methods. The prophets entreated the deity to reveal to them directly by inspiration or vision. Often they simply waited until the revelation came spontaneously. There are thus a number of marked distinctions between magic and religion. The most valuable of these is the impersonal or the personal approach employed by the magician or the worshipper.

There is much debate and difference of opinion among scholars as to which of these, magic or religion, came first in the history of mankind. "For our traditional Western thought, magic and religion are always more or less consciously contrasted with one another, whence students have often unwarrantably assumed that the two are radically heterogeneous, and that they represent successive strata in the mental development of mankind. Some investigators argue that magic is the earlier and

ruder product (e.g. Frazer), while others (e.g. Erman) hold it to be a debased corruption of the nobler phenomenon of religion."[1] It, however, matters little here whether magic grew out of religion or religion out of magic because, as the last few pages have indicated, they were so closely associated as to be inseparable. This will be further demonstrated in an examination of Babylonian and Egyptian religion. The same will be seen to be true of the religion of Israel. The prophets of the eighth century B.C., and later, purged their religion of magic to a large extent. How far they went in this purging is one of the problems this paper must answer.

(1) Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, Vol. VIII, p. 262b.

MAGIC AND RELIGION IN BABYLONIA

If one were to read in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible under the article entitled, "Religion of Babylonia" subtitle "Incantation rituals" with one's hand placed over the title it would be impossible to say whether one is reading an account of religion or of magic so closely are the two interwoven. The next few pages consist largely of a summary, together with quotations, of the above mentioned article.

Appeal was made to the gods against the demons through the medium of priests acting as exorcizers. The power of the priests lay in the use of the proper words which would serve to check the action of the demons, accompanied by certain symbolical rites, such as ablution and purification. Thus prayer in Babylonia consisted of the uttering of certain appeals to the gods in which the essential thing was the use of the correct words rather than the motive which prompted the appeal. Thus there developed an elaborate ritual of the correct formula to be used in a certain case (and thus force the deities) to relieve a person from evil spirits. These formulae were grouped to form a temple ritual, and the priests, after observing which formula was most effective in given cases, would note the success of that formula and use it again in similar cases. Many of these series of formulae have been found during excavations.

One series consisting of 16 tablets, is known as the "Evil Demons." Another consisting of 9 tablets was called "Head-sickness," because a goodly portion of it was devoted to formulae for ridding individuals of various diseases that had their seat in the head and were due to some demon that had taken up its abode in the human body. Again, two series bear the names "Maklu" and "Shurpu" (1) respectively, both terms having the sense of "burning" and owe their designation to the prominence assigned in them to the burning of effigies of the demons or of the witches who controlled the demons, as a means of getting rid of their baneful influence. No fewer than ten different kinds of material are prescribed for the making of the images--wax, earth, bronze, honey, clay, pitch, sesame flour, pitch with clay, and two varieties of wood. (One of them cedar, the other has not yet been identified.) By the "law of sympathy" any affliction brought upon the image would also come upon the intended victim. Thus images are not always burned. They may be buried, or submerged in water, or placed in paths and on bridges to be trampled on, or even given a dose of poison. But all these actions are intended to force similar evils to come upon the intended victim. If the image can be rescued from its fate by someone else, e.g. finding a buried or submerged image, the evil can be averted and made of no

(1) From the same root as "saraph", "seraphim" in the Old Testament. See Isaiah Chap. 6

effect.

As among the gods, so too among the demons, functions were divided which occasioned the use of the correct ritual to counteract the function of a particular demon. These rituals thus form a distinct division of Babylonian religious literature and we are probably justified in assuming that they represent the oldest division. The conservative instinct led to the retention of the old primitive religious utterances in these rituals while the impressive hymns and the often strikingly beautiful prayers inserted amidst a jumble of incantation formulas, represent the attempt to give to the old beliefs a more spiritual interpretation.

The following is a good example. The first part merits the designation of a hymn, embodying imagery and conceptions that appear to transcend the intellectual horizon of belief in the efficacy of sacred formulae.

"O Nusku, great god, chief of the great gods,
Guardian of the offerings of all the Igigi (1)
Founder of cities, restorer of sanctuaries;
Brilliant day, whose command is supreme;
Messenger of Anu, (2) obedient to the decrees of Bel;
Mighty in battle, whose attack is powerful.
Nusku, glowing, overthrower of enemies,

(1) A designation for the throng of heavenly deities or spirits.
(2) The god of heaven.

Without thee no sacrificial feast is held in E-kur:

Without the Shamash the judge does not execute any judgement."

(1) "Up to this point we appear to have before us a hymn composed in honour of Nusku that might appropriately have been sung in connection with a sacrificial ritual in a temple erected in honour of the god in question. The following lines, however, reveal the real purpose of the invocation. The victims, about to burn the images of the evil powers that have brought about his misfortune, is represented as saying:

"I, thy servant (so and so)(2) son of (so and so)(2)
Whose god is (so and so)(2) whose goddess is (so and so)(2)

I turn to thee, I seek thee, I raise my hands, I prostrate myself before thee

Burn my sorcerer and my witch;

May the life of my sorcerer and my witch be taken hold of and destroyed!

Let me live that I may praise thee, and in humility extol thee."

Or similarly:

"On this day, arise(3) to my judgement:

(1) Quoting from Hasting's.
(2) Appropriate names to be inserted.
(3) Address is to the fire-god.

Suppress the mischief, overpower the evil.
As these images tremble, dissolve and melt away,
So may the sorcerer and sorceress tremble,
dissolve and melt away."

Correlative to the belief in the power of the priest to exorcise the evil demons, we find among the Babylonians the belief in the power of certain individuals over the demons, with a view to bringing other individuals under their influence. This is more commonly ascribed to women than to men. It is often very difficult to distinguish between a demon and a witch. The strange and weird impression made by individuals who are of deformed stature, like dwarfs, or who have unusual features, unusually large or unusually small eyes, or otherwise presenting a grotesque appearance would prompt the conclusion that such persons possessed unusual powers and were capable of working mischief. Because evil was associated with demons, it was a logical conclusion that these strange individuals were in league with the demons, or were actually evil spirits that had assumed human shape. Diseases were generally attributed to demons working at the instigation of a witch or sorcerer or to demons working independently. The incantation rituals clearly betray this composite character aiming its exorcizing rites sometimes at witches and sorceress and sometimes at demons directly.

These passages, with their appeal to the great gods of

Babylon in a purely magical rite, together with their occasional noble religious expressions, clearly indicate how inseparable are magic and religion among the Babylonians.

MAGIC AND RELIGION IN EGYPT

Among the Egyptians there existed the practice which they called "hike" (from the coptic ϩⲓⲕ) whereby they sought to force the gods and the spirits of the dead to grant them their wish, when the more common methods such as requests, prayers, commands, promises, or threats failed. The best translation of "hike" into English is by the word "magic" and its practice or use is best understood by "magic power." The use of this magic "postulated special powers in its user and always made a greater or lesser demand upon faith.----So far as Egypt is concerned, there cannot be the slightest doubt that 'hike' was part and parcel of the same 'Weltanschauung' as created religion which it deeply interpenetrated."(1)

"From the Egyptian point of view we may say that there was no such thing as 'religion', and there was only 'hike', the nearest English equivalent of which is 'magical power.' The universe being populated by three homogeneous groups of beings--the gods, the dead, and living human persons---- their actions, whether within a single group or as between one group and another, were either ordinary or uncanny ("hike"). But the gods and the dead were somewhat uncanny themselves, so that all dealings with them or performed by them were more or less 'hike'. It was only when men

(1) Ency. Rel. and Eth. VIII, p. 262b.

treated them ordinarily, and as man to man, that all this quality of 'hike' was reduced to a minimum, as in the case of spontaneous prayer and the letters to the dead--- in fact, just in those rare instances where the solemn phraseology of ritual was avoided."[1] This personal, man to man relationship, is characteristic of religion, the use of the ritualistic belongs chiefly to "hike" or magic.

In these the chief connection between magic and religion is seen in the use of the names of certain gods, especially that of Horus, in the oral rites used. The description of Egyptian gods and their functions is very difficult not only because of the many gods in their religious system but also because of the distinctions in the individual forms and functions of one god which are found in various localities. Thus the god Horus, according to A. Wiedemann,[2] has no less than nine independent individual forms.

A few quotations from oral rite using the name of the god Horus may be given: "Thou flyest before the sorcerer, before the servant of Horus, as soon as he mentions the name of Horus, or the name of Seth the Lord of heaven. He raiseth his scimitar, and smiteth thy forearm and thy throat. Thou fallest upon the ground on which thy loincloth is spread, and there thou gropest in quest of thy

(1) Ency. Rel. and Eth. VIII, p. 263a
(2) Hasting's Ext. Vol. p. 184b

heart. So dost thou die, and the report goes forth from the house of Rēʿ that Horus has conquered the disease."

Sometimes a magician frustrates the aims of the enemy by a simple veto. Other times he uses commands warnings and persuasive means. In the last resort he employs curses which are often severe and daring. On such occasions the magician is apt to disclaim his responsibility and place it on another god. However he generally summons one or more of the gods to his aid. "Hail to thee, Horus, thou art in the town of Hundreds, thou sharp-horned one, who shootest at the mark----I come to thee, I praise thy beauty; destroy thou the evil that is in my limbs."(1)

As a rule the magician either identifies himself with the god or considers himself a servant of the god.

The manual rites of the Egyptians fall into two classes, the active elements and the negative or precautionary elements. The former, as in the case of the Babylonians, involves the use of images, made of wax, clay, or other materials, whereby the magician seeks by sympathetic means to bring harm or good to an individual. Tying and untying knots is also an Egyptian form of magic, the common number of knots being 4,7 and 12.

The negative elements consist of the wearing of amulets, images, beads, or knots to ward off evil and to

(1) Ency. Rel. and Eth. VIII p. 265a.

protect the wearer. "If the poison pass these seven knots, which Horus has made on his body, I will not allow the sun to shine."[1]

The above descriptions of Babylonian and Egyptian religion are only mere glimpses. Hundreds of pages would be required to deal adequately with them. Yet this brief summary makes it possible to examine the earlier writings of Israel and to determine whether there too magic and religion are interwoven. In some cases we may find the idea of magic hidden underneath the account of the event, the account being written during a time when that particular form of magic had been outgrown or rationalized.

(1) Ency. Rel. and Eth. VIII, p. 266b.

MAGIC AND RELIGION IN ISRAEL BEFORE THE EIGHTH CENTURY PROPHETS

In passing over to a consideration of the part which magic played in the religion of Israel the surprising fact is, not that there is so much of magic, but so little, to be found. The neighboring peoples employed much more magic in their religion than did the Israelites. Still there is a significant amount of it to be found in Israel. The Old Testament contains many examples of pure, simple magic. The most important are perhaps those which are connected with the prophets Elijah and Elisha. J.M.P. Smith[1] may be correct in maintaining that, because these two prophets "are both credited with deeds that are strangely alike" and because "the narratives are full of legendary and folk-lore elements" therefore grave doubt as to their historicity arises. Even so, they reflect the beliefs of the people of the time, having arisen very shortly after the death of these prophets. For this reason they may well be used here.

Both Elijah and Elisha are credited with the magical feat of making a widow's supply of oil go much farther than it normally would.[2] In Elijah's case he is authenticated as a man of God in the eyes of the widow by

(1) J.M.P. Smith, "The Prophets and their Times" pp. 36, 37.
(2) I Kings, 17:1-16 and II Kings 4:1-7.

causing her jar of meal and flask of oil never to give out by simply commanding her to give him the last cake baked therefrom which cake she had intended for her son and herself before they died When she saw his power she addressed him as a man of God. Elisha's performance is similar. The poor widow is simply ordered to shut herself in with her sons and pour the oil from her flask into as many flasks as she could borrow from her neighbors. As soon as all were filled the oil stopped flowing and she had enough to pay her debts.

Elisha is regarded as so charged with magical power that he need only speak to cause the leprosy of Naaman to pass to his own servant Gehazi.(1) Even after his death his body retained such power that when another dead body was hurriedly and carelessly flung into his tomb and came into contact with his body, it immediately sprang up alive.(2)

Elisha was also an adept in the use of sympathetic or as it is sometimes called, imitative magic.(3) The prophets' followers had brewed a mess of pottage and on its being tasted it was immediately apparent that in the gathering of the herbs some of poisonous variety had been included. The prophets realized that to eat it meant death. Then Elisha, by simply adding a bit of harmless

(1) II Kings 5:27
(2) II Kings 13:20-21
(3) II Kings 4:38-41

meal, made the entire mess harmless. The thought behind this is that like produces like, the harmless meal therefore produced harmless pottage. Another very interesting instance of this type of magic is found in II Kings 6:5-7. Here is an account of how a member of the prophets' guild dropped his axe-head into the water. Elisha is called to the scene and raises it to the surface by cutting a stick (probably in the shape of the axe-head) and throwing it into the water at the spot where the axe-head fell. This again is sympathetic magic,[1] the axe-head swims because the wood swims.

Jacob also was able to employ sympathetic magic to his own advantage.[2] He had arranged with his father-in-law, Laban that he would tend his flock and receive in return for his services all the spotted or striped sheep. For this reason he planned to have as many spotted lambs as possible in the flock. This was accomplished by placing pealed poplar trees "in the runnels of the watering-troughs at which the flocks drank; they bred when they came to drink, and as they bred in front of the sticks they brought forth young that were striped, speckled, and spotted." Jacob was cunning enough to arrange that the strongest animals should breed under these circumstances.

One of the important beliefs in the realm of magic is

(1) Oesterly and Robinson, "Hebrew Rel." p.89.
(2) Gen. 30-37-39.

the belief that clothing and other objects which have been associated with a magician or other supernatural person in some mysterious way contain his power, or spirit, or character.[1] Thus in II Kings there is the account of how Elisha requests to fall heir to Elijah's spirit and does so by receiving Elijah's mantel. With it he is able to perform feats similar to those of Elijah such as parting water in a stream. The guild of the prophets saw him do this and all were forced thereby to acknowledge, "The spirit of Elijah rests on Elisha."[2]

A note may here be added that belief in such magic continued all through the history of Israel right up to the time of Paul.[3] People in his day were cured of diseases by simply acquiring bits of his clothing. Again, a woman was cured of a severe illness in Jesus' day by simply touching the tassel of his garment.[4]

Regarding the narrative in II Kings 6:18-20 where Elisha is credited with the power of striking blind and giving sight again, Oesterly and Robinson say,[5] "in the text as it stands, it is Yahweh who actually does this, but at Elisha's bidding." They imply by this statement that in the original text Elisha actually performed the deed himself but that a later editor desirous of eliminating

(1) Whitehouse, Hasting's, Vol. IV, 602b.
(2) II Kings 2:15
(3) Acts 9:12
(4) Luke 8:44
(5) Heb. Rel. p.90

some of the magic made Yahweh (יהוה) responsible for the deed. The same may be true of the event dealt with in the following paragraph and the possibility of it being true of other instances must constantly be kept in mind.

In II Kings 2:19-22 there is a good illustration of a magical act in which an incantation is used. Oesterly and Robinson (1) are of the opinion that an incantation must have been in the original account but has been deleted by a later editor. It is not impossible that the words from Yahweh, "I hereby heal these waters, never again shall they cause death or miscarriages", may have originally been words commanded by Yahweh to be said as an incantation. Although salt has purifying, sustaining and antiseptic qualities the act is magical. Elisha used a new flask, which was, practically speaking, unnecessary. He believed that the deity healed the waters, and not the action of the salt. A similar performance is attributed to Moses. (2) The waters of Marah were found to be bitter, whereupon Moses appealed to Yahweh who showed him a certain tree. The tree was cast into the water which immediately became drinkable.

The so called "Song of the Well" (3) is a bit of very ancient poetry. In it the form of magic called rhabdomancy is illustrated. As the well was being dug the

(1) Heb. Rel. p. 88
(2) Ex. 15:25
(3) Num. 21:17-18

chieftains of the tribe were waving their wands and staves probably to insure success in finding water. It is remarkable that in so many instances wands are employed to obtain power over water. A few may be cited. Moses turned the waters of the Nile into blood with a rod,(1) he parted the water of the Red Sea using a wand,(2) he struck a rock to produce water(3) at Kadesh, Elijah used his rolled up mantle,(4) as also did Elisha, his successor.(5)

Most of the magic ascribed to Moses is of this type. When Yahweh gave him his commission to lead the Israelites to freedom he was to employ rhabdomancy to prove his authenticity. According to Oesterly and Robinson(6) only in three cases can the references to Moses' magic rod be regarded as coming strictly under the head of magic. These are Moses' rod turning into a serpent,(7) the holding up of his rod by assistants to insure victory in battle,(8) and the other instance already mentioned, where he draws water from a rock.(9) "These are clear instances in which the powers of the magic rod are believed in. The thing is, however, of animistic origin, though this origin has been quite lost sight of; but it is, in reality, a spirit which is supposed to reside in the rod and to effect what is required. An echo of this is to be seen in the fact that the rod is stated to be 'the rod of God.'"(10),(11)

(1) Ex. 14:15 This seems to be a later addition.
(2) Num. 20:11
(3) Ex. 7:17
(4) II Kings 2:8
(5) II Kings 2:14
(6) Heb. Rel. p. 90
(7) Ex. 4:2 ff.
(8) Ex. 17:8ff.
(9) Num. 20:8 ff.
(10) Ex. 17:9
(11) O. & R. Rel. Heb. p.90

Elisha also employed rhabdomancy.[1] When the widow reported to him that her boy was dead he immediately sent Gehazi, his servant, to place his rod across the child's face. Exactly what he intended to do thereby, is not known. It may have been a first attempt to restore life to him or merely a means to prevent his spirit from going too far away. The rest of the story affords another interesting illustration of sympathetic magic together with the use of magical numbers. Elisha went up to his own room where the child had already been placed by its mother and prayed to Yahweh. The religious significance of this prayer is, however, discounted by the employment of such sympathetic and numeric magic as stretching "himself over the child, putting his mouth on the child's mouth, his eyes on the child's eyes, and his hands on the child's hands, till as he crouched over the child, its flesh grew warm. Rising up he walked to and fro, and then went and stretched himself seven times over the child, till it opened its eyes." The magic content here is obvious. A similar story is attributed to Elijah, who believes as the widow does that Yahweh killed the child. He revives it by prayer[2] and crouching over the child three times. One cannot help but realize the marked contrast between these accounts and, for example, that of Jesus' raising

(1) II Kings 4:17-37
(2) One is inclined to regard the prayer as introduced later. It may originally have been an incantation.

of Lazarus.[1] Jesus also prayed but then he called Lazarus as he would have called him to come out of a house. The method is entirely personal, without the slightest trace of magic.

Regarding the event which took place shortly before Elisha's death, it will be wise to quote from Oesterly and Robinson,[2] "Another striking piece of imitative magic is recounted of Elisha in II Kings 13:14-19, he tells Joash the king of Israel to take bow and arrows; then he lays his hands upon the king's hands (that constitutes a magical act), and bids him open the window eastward, i.e. in the direction of Syria, looking from Samaria, where this takes place. Next he tells the king to shoot an arrow, which he does, whereupon Elisha utters an incantation: 'A victory-arrow from Yahweh, a victory-arrow against Aram (Syria).' That is the first part of the ritual. Then follows the imitative magic. Elisha bids the king smite the ground with the arrows; he does so three times; he ought to have done it five or six times, then he would have wholly defeated the Syrians. Since he has only done it three times, he will only gain three victories over them."

Sympathetic magic is also found in the narrative which gives the reason why the Philistines returned

(1) John 11:43
(2) Heb. Rel. p. 89.

the Ark of Yahweh, and the method in which this was done.[1] The Ark was in alien country and therefore its magical potency brought a curse instead of a blessing. Its presence caused tumours and mice, so in sending it back the Philistines employed a bit of sympathetic magic to make certain that it also took away the plagues it brought. Five golden tumours and five golden mice were placed beside the Ark which had been placed on a new cart drawn by two milch cows never before harnessed. Thus the Ark was sent away. It is true that the Philistines performed this act, but the Hebrews wrote the account and the validity of the act is not questioned. Once again in its own country the Ark brought blessings rather than curses, at least this may be assumed from the manner in which the household of Obed-edom was blessed during the time the Ark remained in his house.[2]

There is some uncertainty whether or not the raising of the bronze serpent in the wilderness by Moses[3] is sympathetic magic or not. Oesterly and Robinson,[4] however, say it is possible to regard it as imitative magic.

It has already been indicated that Elijah and Elisha are credited with power to control running water. Elisha and Moses are said to have healed bitter and impure

(1) I Sam. 6:1-11
(2) II Sam. 6:11
(3) Num. 21:4-9
(4) Heb. Rel. p. 89 (ft. note)

drinking water. "Samuel is represented as bringing rain[1] by calling unto Yahweh at harvest time, that is, during the dry season."[2] Similarly Elijah was regarded as being able to hinder the coming of rain as well as to cause rain to come.[3]

It would perhaps be fairly difficult if not impossible to find a method of rain-making similar to that employed by Elijah. A part of this difficulty is due to the late editing of the account and to the changes made by the editor. To point out just where changes were made would be fairly difficult, but to indicate such instances which are of the nature of rain-making magic is comparatively easy. It will be noted that the purpose of the whole event is to bring rain. With this intention Elijah goes to show himself to Ahab. The prophet and the Baal prophets each put their God to the test. The deity which answers with fire, probably originally with lightning and rain,[4] was to be considered the real God. After Baal fails to answer, Elijah proceeds to build an altar of stones, dig a trench around it and then to pour water over this stone altar. According to the Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics[5] "Stones are often supposed to possess the power of bringing rain, provided they are

(1) I Sam. 12:16-18
(2) O. and R. Heb. Rel. p. 88
(3) I Kings 18:1-46
(4) See v. 38
(5) Vol. X p. 562

brought into contact with water.------No doubt the fact that stones are often regarded as the abodes of spirits[1] accounts for their use as rain-making charms. Also, "pouring water is a common feature in ceremonies for the procuring of rain in some parts of the world." There can be little doubt as to the significance of Elijah's pouring the water over the stones. After Yahweh's answer with lightning, the prophets of Baal were not simply slain, but were taken down to the brook Kishon and there slain that their blood might mingle with the waters. This again is significant. Immediately thereafter Elijah heard the sound of the downpour of rain. He hurried to the top of Mt. Karmel and there crouched down with his head between his knees. This strange posture also suggests a magical explanation. The magical element is again seen in that the servant was commanded to go and look seven times. After the seventh time the rain came down so fast that Ahab had to hurry home lest the rain stop him.

"Necromancy is a part of ancestor worship which falls under the heading of religion, but in the very name necromancy lies an implication of magic."[2] From the account of Saul's visit to the witch of Endor[3] it is clear that the Israelites believed in the validity of necromancy, but at the time the account was written it was

(1) Early Israelites regarded stones as the abodes of spirits. O. and R. Rel. Sem. p45
(2) Ency. Brit. art. "Magic."
(3) I Sam. 28

regarded as an evil practice. Saul, in seeking advice as to how to deal with the Philistine menace, had tried to get an oracle in all the legitimate ways known to him. But all of them, dreams, sacred lot and prophets, had failed him. In despair he disguised himself and sought out the witch of Endor whose practice he himself had condemned. The scene in her dwelling was a typical séance where necromancy is practiced. It was night, the light in the house was dim. Saul requested to have Samuel brought up, but Saul himself did not see him. The witch described Samuel and Saul recognized the description and told him of his trouble. In a faint voice, probably one such as Isaiah (1) describes so well, "ghosts that cheep and gibber in low murmurs," Samuel replied "tomorrow you shall fall with your sons at your side." Is it any wonder that Saul did fall?

As has already been suggested, Saul had forbidden the traffic with mediums and wizards having banned them from the land. Although the Covenant code contains no condemnation of necromancy as such there is a condemnation of witches or sorceresses. (2) This is a further indication that the Israelites must have believed in necromancy for as F.B. Jevons (3) says, "A wizard----has always been punished as a criminal all over the world by the people who believe in the possibility of such commerce." One

(1) Isa. 8:19
(2) Ex. 22:18, Lev. 20:27.
(3) F.B. Jevons, Hastings Vol.I p.612b

reason for this condemnation may be their anti-social character. The Book of Chronicles represents one of the causes of Saul's death as being "because he had consulted a medium."[1]

The efficacy of curses plays a very large part in early Israel. The Covenant Code[2] commands that the man who curses his father or mother must be put to death. The reason for this severity was due to the belief that anyone who curses his parents brings actual disaster upon them. Therefore he must be punished just as he would be were he to use bodily force to do them harm.

It is to be noted that the firm belief in the terrible power of the curse is plainly connected with the irresistable efficacy of the solemnly invoked divine name. "Abimelech succumbs to the curse of Jotham[3]; Micah escapes the effects of his mother's curse by prompt restitution of the money he had stolen from her; and his mother at once removes the curse by pronouncing a formula of blessing, in which the name of Yahweh is invoked;[4] the curse of Elisha in the name of Yahweh brings summary destruction upon forty-two children."[5] [6]

Such a belief in curses was very valuable in a community in which little law prevailed to regulate matters between individuals. The value of an oath, which

(1) I Chron. 10:13
(2) Ex. 21:17
(3) Judges 9:20, 57
(4) Judges 17:1 ff.
(5) II Kings 2:24
(6) E. Kautzch, Hastings Ext. Vol. p. 640 (ft. note.)

was so often used at trials,[1] was directly dependent upon the belief in the potency of the curse. Thus an innocent person may say: "May Yahweh kill me if I am guilty of this crime!" A guilty man would never say such a thing. No matter how serious his crime, he would rather confess on being suspected than fall into the hands of Yahweh." In a similar way covenants were maintained. When a covenant was made or cut (for such is the derivation of the word) an animal was slain and cut to pieces and those partaking in the covenant walked between the pieces symbolizing, if not saying, "May Yahweh do to me as we did to this animal if I prove unfaithful in this covenant." Not only curses, but also blessings were regarded as having magical potency. A blessing once correctly pronounced could not possibly be recalled or altered. It was considered as forcing the deity to carry it out. A good example of this is found in the narrative regarding Jacob and Esau. Although Jacob[2] employed fraud and false pretences to obtain his father's blessing, it was considered as binding throughout the ages. Isaac in this case exhibited no feelings of a personal nature toward Yahweh. The whole performance was impersonal and once performed was binding, hence it must be regarded as magical.

Closely connected with the belief in the magical efficacy of curses and blessings is the belief in the

(1) Ex. 22:11
(2) Gen. 27:35 f.

magical potency of the written or spoken word, especially of names. The Hebrew practice of hanging a so-called Mezuzah over the right door-post involves an ancient belief in the magic potency of written words and names.[1] The Mezuzah (מְזוּזָה - lit. "a door-post.") contains the "Shema", that is, the passage found in Deuteronomy 6:4-9 and 11:13-21. The same words were contained in Amulets which were to be bound as a sign upon the hand and for frontlets between the eyes. Both of these items containing written words or names having mysterious potency were held to possess a magic and protective efficacy. Such beliefs are by no means extinct today. In fairness, it may be added, that the Jewish Rabbis today do not regard their Mezuzah as in anyway magical. Rabbi Eisen says,[2] "The Mezuzah on the door-post is not a charm to ward off evil or to bring good luck. It is a reminder that the Jew is to regard the home as a sacred institution." Nevertheless, its origin is magical and it has always been so regarded by the masses. Oesterly and Robinson say "the custom is at least pre-Christian: it is refered to by Josephus (Antig. IV, 8:13); the Rabbis in Talmudic times attributed to it a protective power against demons, and this doubtless was the original purpose of it."[3]

Amulets such as mentioned above were permitted in

(1) Whitehouse, Hasting's Vol. IV p. 602a.
(2) "The Scroll" c. Dec. 12, 1935
(3) Heb. Rel. p. 99

Israel, only those of foreign origin were forbidden. In later Jewish literature the amulet was called a "kemea" (קמיע). It is interesting to note that this name is mentioned in connection with phylacteries (תפילין). "In all spells, charms, incantations, amulets, and other prophylactics, stress is always laid on the mysterious potency and significance of the name. 'Nomen' involves 'omen'. Name to the ancient Semite involves reality and personal power--------. To this tendency the etymologizing efforts and plays on words in the O.T. are probably due, viz. to the endeavor to discover in the name a clue to the underlying power that shapes individual destiny. 'As his name, so is he', says Abigail of her wrong-headed husband Nabal. 'Fool is his name, and folly is with him.'(1) The combination of the name of deity with a newborn child was therefore quite explicable.---Hence those names--which contain the name of deity possess a special potency."(2)

This is true of human names and is just as true of the Divine name.(3) Knowledge of the divine name is of vital importance, for this is the condition of being able to use it in invocation which according to primitive notions has a real efficacy giving the person who invokes the name a certain power over the name invoked, so that he can compel its aid. This explains why in so many religions the name of the deity is kept studiously secret

(1) I Sam. 25:25
(2) Whitehouse, Hasting's Vol. IV p. 604a.
(3) Kautzch, Hasting's Ext. Vol. p. 640b.(ft.nt.)

lest it might be abused through being invoked by the improper party. There is a trace of this in the Old Testament.[1] Jacob, on his journey toward his brother Esau, struggled one night with a mysterious man, originally perhaps a manifestation of Yahweh. Toward the end of the struggle Jacob said, "Tell me what is your name" but the man only answered, "Why ask my name?" and did not reveal it. In the case of Manoah and the angel, who had predicted the birth of Samson, the angel answered, "Why ask my name?" and then added the significant words, "it is not to be uttered." Here the manifestation of Yahweh refuses to give its name and thereby escapes any further annoyance, as it were. It may even be possible that the commandment not to take the name of Yahweh "in vain" originally meant not to invoke it improperly and thus compel action.

Another aspect of magic in Israel to be mentioned is so apparent that it need only be mentioned and not enlarged. As Coe says,[2] "Traffic with the gods of a conquered people is by the conquerors condemned as diabolical magic." That the people of Israel did have traffic with the gods of the Canaanites is indisputable. One need only glance at a few pages from I or II Kings to be convinced. This Commerce with other gods was violently opposed by the eighth century prophets.

(1) Gen. 32:30, Judges 13:18
(2) Coe, "Psych. Rel." p. 91

In the intermingling of magic and religion there are generally two processes or tendencies in operation. The first is the tendency, chiefly among the common people, for religious ritual to degenerate into magical practices. Many are of the type of mind that tends to regard the ritual as a means of forcing or controlling the deity. The second tendency is found most frequently among the priestly classes. It is a process of rationalization whereby elements that were originally magic are reclothed and retained in religion.

An interesting example of thus rationalizing and retaining in religion an element that originally belonged to magic is the use of sacred numbers, especially the number "seven." It is to be found in the oldest writings and traditions of Israel right down to the latest of the priestly writings. The origin of the sacredness of the number seven is probably foreign and "if a foreign source is to be sought for the growing disposition to connect 'seven' with religious notions, the influence of Babylonia suggests itself most readily."(1) It must be recognized however, that the adjective "sacred" was latter attributed to the number when its magical content was lost sight of. An example or two will illustrate the early magical content of the number seven. Samson's superhuman strength was attributed to the "seven plaits (of hair) on his head."(2)

(1) Ed. Koenig, Hasting's, Vol. III, p. 565b.
(2) Judges 16:13 and 19, II Kings 4:33-37.

When these were cut off, his strength failed him, and not until they grew again did he regain his superhuman strength. Elisha, while employing sympathetic magic to resucitate a dead boy, stretched himself seven times over the body, touching hands to hands, and lips to lips. After the seventh time the boy opened his eyes.(1) When Naaman came to be cured of leprosy Elisha would not even come out to see him but sent him word to bathe seven times in the Jordon. This Naaman did reluctantly and was cured of his disease.

Other numbers were considered to have magical power by the Israelites, but none of them ever equaled the potency of the number seven. This magically potent number "seven" later became sacred and occupied an important place in priestly ritual. Blood was to be sprinkled seven times,(2) seven animals were to be sacrificed,(3) and many other instances could be quoted.

By far the most interesting is its connection with the swearing of an oath. To swear means literally, to "seven" oneself or as W.R. Smith says, "to come under the influence of seven things." Thus seven ewe lambs figure in the oath between Abraham and Abimeleck at Beersheba."(4)

The seeking and obtaining of an oracle is very easily

(2) Lev. 4:6, 17, 8:11, 14:7ff. 16:14, 19:4 Kings II 5:10
(3) Nu. 21:8ff. Ezak. 45:23 II Chron. 29:21
(4) W.R. Smith, "Rel. of the Semites" p. 182
(1) I Kings. 4:33-37

classified under the first tendency mentioned in a former paragraph, namely, the tendency for ritual to degenerate into magic. Many would regard it as soothsaying but that is the result of losing sight of the fact that the deity is, by means of some mechanical device, revealing the divine will.

Saul had gone to the witch of Endor to obtain an oracle or to determine how the omens read. Israel, as well as her neighbors, was a firm believer in omens. Jacob is told (1) by Laban that the omens indicate he should remain in his service. How the omen was obtained in this case is not stated but Israel practised various methods. One was the divining cup used by Joseph in Egypt. (2) The method here is probably by means of noting the colors and formations of oil floating on water.

Among the means attempted by Saul to get an oracle before he went to the witch the sacred lot is mentioned. This method of using the sacred lots in connection with the "ephodh" or image of the deity was perhaps the one most widely used in early Israel. Here again there is difficulty in determining the exact nature of the practice. The difficulty is due to the alteration and deletion of passages by later writers and editors. This statement is substantiated by the fact that the word אֵפוֹד (ēphodh)

(1) Gen. 30:27
(2) Gen. 44:2-15

has two distinct meanings, the one apparently derived from one phase of the earlier meaning. In the earlier literature the word "ephodh" no doubt refered to an image of the deity. Such references as Gideon's use of 1700 shekels of gold of the spoil he had taken, in the making of an "ephodh" and his setting it in Ophrah make it impossible to regard it as anything other than an image.(1) The account of Micah's "ephodh" among the other household gods(2) reinforces the former reference. Other instances could be cited but these two will suffice to illustrate the point.

However, the word "ephodh" later took on an entirely different meaning having reference to a garment worn by the priest. This derivation was probably obtained from the cloak which was apparently cast about the shoulders of the image. Dealing as we are with the earlier times we can safely take the word of Kautzch,(3) that in these times the "ephodh" was simply an image of the deity.

There are several notable examples in I and II Samuel of the use of the "ephodh." In I Samuel 14:2 and 3 Saul it is under the pomegrante tree seeking an oracle by using the "ephodh." Again in 14:18 f., but in this case Saul interrupts the priest Ahijah in the consultation because of the growing tumult in the Philistine camp.

(1) Judges 8:26 f.
(2) Judges 17:5
(3) Kautzch, Hasting's Ext. Vol. p. 641b.

More illuminating is the account of Saul's seeking to determine by means of the sacred lot the reason for Yahweh's anger and his consequent reluctance to give an oracle regarding the question of attacking the Philistines.(1) This passage renders a suggestion of the manner in which the sacred lots were used. Apparently the image either in itself or in its garment had a pocket containing the sacred lots. The priest placed his hand upon the "ephodh" and drew out the lots which were so constructed that they could give a positive or a negative answer or also no answer at all. Oesterly and Robinson(2) offer the following interesting suggestion. "These, the 'Urim and Thummim,' were probably flat stones, white on one side and black on the other. If both fell white side upwards the answer was in the affirmative, if black side upwards then a negative; if they differed, no reply was vouchsafed to the question." The use of the ephodh as the image of the deity and the prayer uttered by Saul(3) force one to realize the religious nature of the whole act. In I Samuel 23:9 ff, there is an interesting example of David using the ephodh. He was being pursued by Saul and had taken refuge in the town of Keilah. He was uncertain as to what would befall him so he summoned Abiathar to bring the ephodh to him. His first question was as to whether Saul would come to

(1) I Samuel 14:37-44
(2) Heb. Rel. p. 150
(3) v. 41 Latter part of the verse is from the Septuagint.

Keilah. The question was answered positively. The second was whether the citizens of Keilah would hand him over to Saul. Again the answer was positive, so David and his men took to the hills.

Somewhat later[1] he consulted the ephodh as to the advisability of pursuing the Amelekites to rescue the wives of the men of Ziklag. The answer was "pursue them." On two other occasions[2] we read of David consulting Yahweh but the method is not mentioned. One can see how easily the use of the ephodh could, in the popular mind, degenerate into magic.

In concluding this section a note on sacrifices may be added. Because of their ritualistic tendency, i.e. seeking to influence the deity one is tempted to class at least early sacrifices as magical. When Noah offered his sacrifice at the end of the flood Yahweh could not help but bless Noah and the earth.[3] Again after the King of Moab had sacrificed his son to his god Chemosh[4] upon the wall in full view of his enemies, the kings of Israel, Judah and Edom, they were "afraid to press the siege after what they believed to be an irresistible appeal to Chemosh."[5]

But in each of these cases, as with sacrifice generally, there is a personal relationship which lifts it

(1) I Sam. 30:7 f.
(2) II Sam. 2:1 f. 5:19
(3) Gen. 8:20-22
(4) II Kings 3:27
(5) W.H. Bennett, Hasting's Vol. III p. 411a

at onee out of the realm of magic and into the realm of religion. During Noah's sacrifice Yahweh smelled the "soothing fragrance" and blessed Noah, just as Jacob blessed his son after eating the meal he had prepared for him. The sacrifice which the King of Moab offered Chemosh was the greatest he could bring, but it was also the most personal. That sacrifice, even in its origin was not magical, is further substantiated by the following quotations: "E.B. Tylor---regarded the rite as simply the offering of a gift or bribe to a divinity, precisely analogous to the gift or bribe that might be offered to an Oriental potentate and for analogous reasons--to secure favour or to avert anger. As the gods recede from man, the gift becomes more and more an act of homage and self-abnegation."-----"W.R. Smith----When the god is angry, his favor can be restored by an act of communion between him and his worshippers; and the victim is the non-human member of the clan (i.e. the totem.) When the nomad ceases from his wandering life and becomes an agriculturist the sacrifice is not so much a communion as a tribute." (1)

But in spite of all this, sacrifice may be magical, depending upon the attitude of the worshipper. The various attitudes account for the existence and apparently equal validity of several theories regarding magic. Thus W. Robertson Smith holds that sacrifice was a rite of

(1) Ency. Rel. and Eth. Vol. XI p. 36

communion with God. Another interpretation says it is a substitutionary offering. A third view regards it as a gift to Yahweh. Lastly, Wundt, says that the sacrificial act mysteriously brings the power of the Deity into direct touch with the person offering the sacrifice.(1) This last view could easily be classified as magical. If the ritual be regarded as ipso facto influencing the will of the deity then it belongs in the sphere of magic. To save sacrifice from magic the personal element must be retained. The worshipper must seek to please the deity in all things in which he believes the deity takes pleasure and not place his sole reliance on the act of sacrifice. This is the big mistake that the Israelites made according to prophets like Amos, in short, Amos would regard the sacrifices at Bethel as pure and simple magic.

(1) Taken from J.M.P. Smith "The Origin and History of Hebrew Law." pp. 154-155.

THE RELIGION OF THE EIGHTH CENTURY PROPHETS

In Israel of the eighth century two religious movements can be detected, one among the prophets or forward looking religious leaders, the other among the people or religious followers. The first is a movement from a maximum of magic with a minimum of spiritual insight to a minimum of magic with a maximum of spiritual insight. The second is the tendency found among the common people to permit pure religious ritual to degenerate into mere magical practice. The one seeks to eliminate material things while the other seeks to increase and magnify them.

The former movement is well illustrated in the story of Balak and Balaam.(1) The account is found in "JE," the latter of whom may be regarded as the first of the writing prophets, thus placing the story at the beginning of the period to be considered.

Balak, king of Moab, feared the people of Israel as he saw their myriad clans encamp on the desert near his kingdom on their way to conquer Canaan. The best thing he could do to protect himself and the worst thing he could do to harm Israel was to lay an effective curse upon them. With this in mind he sent his servants to summon Balaam from Pethor on the Euphrates and asked him to pronounce the desired curse. In his opinion the mere

(1) Num. 22-24

pronouncement was all that was necessary for he said,"I know---that he whom you curse is cursed."(1) Balak believed in magic. Balaam on the other hand was beginning to break away from magical ideas. He did believe in the efficacy of the curse but he did not believe that he could compel the deity to carry out whatever curse he uttered. He insisted on first determining the intentions of Yahweh regarding the future of Israel. This he did by seeking an omen through the religious sacrifice of seven bullocks and seven rams upon seven altars. The whole act is religious yet the number seven is indicative of magic. It is probable that he also examined the entrails of the animals and observed the flight of birds, the latter thought being suggested by his going up to the top of a hill where such observation could be easily made. All the omens were favorable for Israel and, to Balak's surprise, Balaam blessed Israel. Balak became angry and demanded Balaam's reason for doing so whereupon he replied, "Must I not be careful to say whatever Yahweh gives me to say?" Such a conviction is religious, not magical. Balak did not yet give up, but summoned Balaam to repeat the sacrifice and if possible to get an answer unfavorable for Israel but the result was as in the first case. As the account now stands a third attempt was made but again Israel was favored. "This made Balak's anger blaze against Balaam;

(1) Num. 22:6

he----told him,---'Be off with you; away home!' " Balaam then rose to his full prophetic height and said "Whatever Yahweh says, I say," and with no recourse to any sacrifice or omen he pronounced another blessing upon Israel.

This movement away from the outward, material, ritualistic practices toward an inner, spiritual insight had its greatest advocates in the persons and work of the eighth century religious leaders. Its development can be traced through the writings of Amos, Hosea, Isaiah and Micah until it finally reached its greatest height, as far as the Old Testament is concerned, in the prophecy of Jeremiah and in chapters 40 to 50 of the book of Isaiah. With the appearance of Ezekiel's priestly codification of the prophetic truths which were a part of his inheritance, the movement did not merely stop but began to move in the opposite direction. The voice of the great prophets was silent. Such prophetic voices as were heard came from minds that were priestly in attitude. Religion was at the mercy of the priestly tendency toward conservation and of the common people's tendency toward degeneration. Magic again was permitted to remain undisturbed.

Before examining this movement more closely it will be necessary to state the psychological basis of religion to be used in this paper.

Much has been made of the functioning of the unconscious or subconscious mind and of the sex instinct in

religion. Some would account for all religious manifestations and practices in terms of the subconscious mind and the sex instinct. Others give the latter a very large place in religion. That sex plays a part in religion cannot be denied, but it is not as dominant as, for example, Freud would have us believe. On the other hand it cannot be denied that in our religious thinking there are processes and integrations taking place of which we are unaware, but that does not necessarily mean that they belong to the subconscious mind.

We must look for the activity of God in the immediate consciousness rather than in the subconscious. Only in cases like that of the Apostle Paul where there has been a repression of religious impulses which formed a complex that eventually dominated the conscious mind, can it be said that the chief factor in religion is the subconscious mind. Once the revolution has taken place then religion operates in the immediate consciousness. It is difficult to say whether the prophets had an experience similar to Paul's but the probability is that they did not. Those religious processes and integrations of which the individual is not aware may be explained by what Hadfield (1) calls the religious sentiment or ideal. He defines a sentiment as "an accepted constellation of instinctive

(1) J.A. Hadfield "Psychology and Morals" p. 24

emotions about the nucleus of an event, thing, person, or ideal". Thus, at the base of all religious thinking and activity lies the religious sentiment.

Taking a cue from Wright (1) the religious sentiment of the eighth century prophets may be described somewhat as follows: The primary object of their religious sentiment is Yahweh whom they seem to regard as quite alone, having no subsidiary objects, such as angels, associated with him. He communicates directly with his prophets. The instinctive emotions or tendencies grouped about this primary object are chiefly three, as far as the prophets are concerned. Named in the reverse order of their influence they are gregariousness, fear and sex, including love and tender emotions. Regarding the word love Oesterly and Robinson write (2) ---"The Hebrew word חֶסֶד 'chesed' (is) quite untranslateable in English. It means love but more than love, for it is not merely an attitude adopted by one person to another, but that essential quality of the soul from which love, sympathy, pity, devotion, all spring. It may produce an attitude of the inferior to the superior, of man to God. It may imply the attitude of the superior to the inferior, of God to man. Or, again, it may be the attitude of equals to one another, of man to man. In any case it implies a full appreciation of and a complete

(1) Wright. "A Student's Phil. of Rel." p.222f.
(2) O. & R. Heb. Rel. p. 207.

devotion to a personality". Another word for love used frequently by the prophets is 'ahēb'(אָהַב), including derivations from this root. It has also a very wide range of meanings, being used to refer to physical sexual relationships, love toward a son, a friend, a master, a neighbor, and God, and also to the Divine love toward individual men, the people Israel and righteousness.(1) Such then would be the religious sentiment of the prophets, the instincts of gregariousness, fear and sex forming a psychological constellation about the primary object, Yahweh. This religious sentiment they accepted as their ideal and it thus influenced and guided all their thinking and all their activity.

Grouped around the religious sentiment and together with it are : first, such non-specific tendencies as imitation, suggestion and sympathy; second, such complex emotions as awe and reverence; third, such sentiments as are felt toward goodness, purity of heart, wisdom, justice, etc. Awe and reverence may also be regarded as forming a part of the religious sentiment itself, being a sublimation of fear.

It is evident that the religious sentiment is not the same for all of the prophets but varies for each individual. With certain men one or more of the constituents or

(1) See Brown, Driver and Briggs, "Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament", pp. 12 f.

associates of the sentiment will predominate. Amos places his chief emphasis on justice, Hosea on love, Isaiah on awe and wisdon, Micah on holiness and righteousness and Jeremiah on love and purity of heart. A comparison may be drawn between Isaiah and Micah. The former was reared in Jerusalem, and seems to have had some connection with the ruling house and with the priests. He would thus regard the temple as very valuable if not essential to religion. With him the gregarious instinct would be stronger than with Micah who was reared in the country and had little or no use for the temple. Again, this gregariousness is almost nil in the case of Jeremiah.

Before dealing with each of the prophets individually it will be wise to take account of some general psychological principles regarding prophecy.

From the above description one can easily understand that there is something about religion which is mysterious and unexplainable to the individual, some processes of which he is unconscious. These need not be relegated to a so-called unconscious mind but may more profitably be regarded as the operation of the religious sentiment.

Coe[1] is quite correct in maintaining that a religious instinct does not exist. Religion is the

(1) Psych. Rel. pp. 323, 324.

result, not of an instinct, but of a certain grouping of several instincts. Wright[1] correctly says that in a strictly scientific sense there is no religious instinct, but popularly the religious sentiment may be regarded as a religious instinct. The intuitions of religious leaders are quite similar to those of the artist or poet. The whole environment of the man acts and reacts upon his sentiments, generally unperceived, until a thought crystallizes and suddenly breaks forth with such clarity and vividness that it appears to be an entirely new revelation. "There is no evidence that a religious intuition (or insight) ever occurs--without dependence upon his own accumulated experience, and without dependence upon the history of his people."[2] "That the inspiration process in religion is in no sense separate or peculiar will be clear to anyone who will examine literary and other artistic inspirations and then note the parallel ways in which new ideas arise in the common life."[3] Coe is not alone in the expression of such views. Caird[4] puts it thus, "Yet the most violent revolution to which human nature can be subjected can never be more than the emergence into light of something that has been growing for a long time beneath the surface, what seems at first

(1) Students Phil. of Rel. p. 222
(2) Coe, Psych. Rel. p. 323
(3) ibid. p. 199
(4) Ed. Caird. Evolution of Religion Vol. I p. 200

an absolute change is never other than the summed up result of a series of variations; and the final touch which makes the elements crystallize into a new form can be regarded as its real cause only by superficial observers."

The prophets were keen observers of the events which transpired both at home and abroad. As Davidson says,(1) "Events furnish the occasion of the prophet's intuitions but they do not set bounds to them." The nature of their sentiments was the final determining factor. Thus both Isaiah and Micah saw the sins of Jerusalem, both saw the rising power of Assyria but the former believed the city would not be destroyed even though a mere remnant be spared while the latter believed in the entire destruction of the city. This is easily understood if one remembers that Isaiah lived in Jerusalem while Micah lived in the country.

The prophet's keen analysis of events greatly assisted him in breaking the imagined connection which magic regarded as real. Magic taught that a connection existed between the magical incantation and ritual and the end desired. So too, the Israelites, especially in the prosperous days of Amos' prophecy, believed there was a real connection between worship at the shrines and national success and prosperity. But the rising power in

(1) A.B. Davidson, Hasting's, Vol. IV p.112b

the north and the "rife disorders on Samaria's hill"[1] forced the prophets to teach that the real connection is between morality and success. Time proved they were correct.

With the prophets the religious sentiment was a strong, powerful driving force which compelled them to action, often against their will. The combination of such powerful instincts as fear and sex make it impossible to restrain the sentiment. Amos says,[2] "When the Lord Yahweh speaks, who can but prophecy?" It is a well known fact that Jeremiah had a profound dislike for public life. He would far rather have spent a quiet life in his native village, Anathoth. But Yahweh had spoken to him. He overcame his childish fear and timidity and continued proclaiming the message in Jerusalem in spite of chains, prisons, and dungeons. Such is the power of the religious sentiment.

An important dynamic psychological factor common to both magic and religion is to be found in man's wishes. Magic was employed to gain such things as man wished to have but could not obtain by natural means. The error which magic made was that it mistook imagined connections for real ones; for example, it assumed that there remained a potent connection between a footprint and the man who made the print. These false connections had to be broken

(1) Amos 3:9
(2) Amos 3:8

before magic could be eliminated from religion. Man's wishes are also a determining factor in religion. The prophets desired certain relationships to become actual. Consequently they prophecied that these relationships would become facts. These prophecies were the expression of their high moral nature and were therefore in line, as it were, with the development of religion, resulting in their gradual acceptance by the people. They were thus establishing genuine and lasting connections between their wishes and their realization. "Now the prophets regarded themselves as exponents of the essential principles of this authentic revelation (תורה Torā) of Yahweh.-----Being men imbued with the spirit of revealed religion and seeing all things in the light of its principles, they were able to develop those principles in their application to new situations as they arose, and bring forth new truth from the depths of their inspired insight into the mind and character of God."(1) However, they regarded these new ethical demands of the deity as having always been demanded by him and thus they read their own aspirations back into history and regarded the desert days as a time of pure, noble, ethical religion.

The idea of wishes as a psychological basis of prophecy is also expressed by Coe,(2) "Ethical progress in any direction is initiated by some individual whose

(1) J. Skinner, Prophecy and Religion. p.3
(2) Psych. Rel. p. 192

satisfaction and dissatisfactions are different from those of other persons. This is ethical originality, which becomes creativeness whenever it effectively organizes and propagates itself.---The degree of the originality in a particular case has to be determined, as well as may be, by historical study of the entire situation."

The activity of the prophets which resulted in the eliminating of magic from religion may be divided into two parts. The first consists of such direct opposition as is found, for example, in the prophecies of Isaiah against necromancy. The second may be regarded as indirect opposition. They were uncompromizingly opposed to the worship of idols in high places. Owen C. Whitehouse says,(1) "The prophets habitually associate magic with idolatry." Hence, in opposing and removing idols they also opposed and removed a certain element of magic such as the fertility cults which were in all probability based on sympathetic magic. Their opposition, however, was chiefly because of ethical reasons. It may be added that, even in the "J" document,(2) carved metal idols are opposed which practically constitutes an opposition to magic, because the carvings and drawings were probably made for their supposed magical effect.

Another phase of indirect opposition is found in

(1) Hasting's Vol. 111 p. 210b.
(2) e.g. Ex. 34:17

Jewish monotheism which did much to destroy magic.[1] However monotheism chiefly destroyed the practice but not the belief in magic. The very fact that the Mishna so often condemns the practice of magic is an indication that the belief persisted. But as Welhausen says of the Arabs, "The old gods are deposed and degraded into the position of demons." Traffic with these old gods or demons was regarded as magic. Therefore, as Yahweh gradually became the only God, and the prophets taught that he alone must be worshipped, in so far as the people obeyed their teachings, the practice of magic gradually disappeared. However this ethical communion with the divine advocated by the prophets was accepted only by a minority of the people probably because the ceremonial was so much easier.[2]

It is interesting to note the prophets do not so much as mention any such forms of magic as rods or arrows or any form of divination, not even the Urim and Thummim. They make no use whatever of magical numbers. Nor do they employ anything that may be classed under sympathetic magic. No miracles such as are attributed to Elijah and Elisha are attributed to these eighth century prophets. When Amos came into conflict with Amaziah[3] he merely argued with him. Were he a man like Moses he would have turned his rod into a serpent, or a man like Elijah he

(1) Whitehouse, Hasting's Vol. IV p. 603a
(2) Coe, Psych. Rel. p. 184
(3) Amos, 7:10-17

would have struck him with blindness to prove his authenticity. Magic in the work of these eighth century men was conspicuous by its absence.

The prophets very often seek to convey a message to their people in the names they give their children. There was, however, nothing magical about these names, they were merely symbolical. This can be clearly seen in the names Hosea gave his children.[1] They are deliberately chosen so that they can be changed later.

The so-called "E" document presents a rather strange mixture of magic and religion. This is probably due to its composite character, but it indicates that the compilor had not clarified his thinking in the matter. "E" may be regarded as the first of the writing prophets, bringing his message to the people in the form of stories. The compilor is a firm believer in rhabdomancy. Moses[2] was to take the rod and work portents with it to prove his authenticity. The incident[3] where Moses held his divine rod while standing on the top of a hill is said by Oesterly and Robinson[4] to come under the head of magic. "E" represents Yahweh as revealing his will and the future in dreams such as those interpreted by Joseph[5] but he also retains the belief in omens. In Numbers 31:1 Balaam builds seven altars to obtain an omen but the compilor fails to record

(1) Hosea Ch. 1
(2) Ex. 4:17
(3) Ex. 18:8 ff.
(4) O. and R. Rel. Heb. p.90
(5) Gen. 20

the examination of the entrails of the sacrificed animals and the observation of the flights of birds, probably indicating his lack of trust in such omens. The facts that the animals were sacrificed and that Balaam went to the top of a hill indicate that the above mentioned methods were in the original account of the story. In the section of the Jacob and Laban story which belongs to "E" there is no magic employed to produce a large flock of striped, speckled and mottled sheep.(1) It is revealed to Jacob in a dream that Yahweh is thus favoring him because of Laban's harsh treatment. Again in Numbers 11: 16 ff there is an account of the seventy sheiks of Israel prophesying. Their prophesying, however, does not seem to be mere contagion as two of the seventy were inside the camp yet they also prophesied. Most noteworthy is the absence of any ritual or music employed to cause the spirit to come upon them.

There is one verse(2) which Moffatt attributes to "E" but which seems to come from a much later period. However if it does belong to "E" it represents a glimpse of a truth which was destined not to be realized for many centuries and, perhaps, has not yet been fully realized today. It reads:

"Jacob needs no omens;

Israel tries no magic arts;

(1) Gen. 31:9 ff.
(2) Nu. 23:23

It is revealed to Jacob and to Israel
What God will do."

As this verse stands in Moffatt's translation it represents the first direct protest against magic. There are other conceptions of religion to be found in "E". Yahweh speaks to common people by means of dreams but not so with his servant Moses, to him he speaks directly, openly, with no dark sayings, because of his faithfulness.(1) Yahweh also listens to Moses' prayers when he pleads on behalf of his people. He answers the prayer and demands no sacrifice. Two examples may be cited. Once because of Yahweh's anger a fire broke out in the camp,(2) but a prayer from Moses caused Yahweh to stop it. Again, on the occasion of Aaron's making the golden calf,(3) Yahweh threatened to destroy the people entirely, but was persuaded not to do so by Moses. If such relinquishing were to be obtained according to priestly authors a sacrifice would have been necessary.(4) Here, however, the relationship between Moses and Yahweh was entirely personal. "E" could not think of that relationship being extended to all the Israelites, yet it was a long step in the right direction.

The prophet Amos of Tekoa makes no direct reference to magic yet his work as a prophet did much in the way of eliminating magic from religion. The dominating factors

(1) Nu. 12:6-8
(2) Nu. 11:1-3
(3) Ex. 32:11-14
(4) cf. II Sam. 24:24 and 25

in and around Amos' religious sentiment are tender emotion and justice and these two are closely knit together. One may say that the former brought the latter into existence. While on his travels he saw how the poor were abused, he could not but sympathize with them and severely denounce the system that permitted such injustice. Harper[1] indicates that because Amos was a nomad his attitude can be largely explained from the general nomadic opposition to luxury. His nomadic prejudices led him to regard it as sinful apart from its exploitation of the poor. In spite of his severe condemnation, those who indulged in luxury, even at the expense of the poor, felt quite safe. The Israelites in general and especially the wealthy classes regarded the offering of sacrifices as all that was necessary. If they were punctilious in their sacrifices it mattered little or nothing what they did in everyday life.

Thus Amos "main contention is that ritual as a substitute for social virtues is an abomination."[2] That the people did regard sacrifice as a substitute for social virtues is evident. They could, for example, "sell the needy for a pair of shoes" and "loll on garments seized in pledge" when they knew that these practices were strictly forbidden in the Covenant Code.[3] Such behavior

(1) W.R. Harper, Internation Critical Commentary, "Amos."
(2) J. Raylor, Hasting's Vol. I p. 87a
(3) cf. Amos 2:6 ff. and Exodus 22:22-27

so grated on Amos' religious sentiment that he could no longer remain silent and he was fully convinced that the words he uttered were the words of Yahweh. But the psychological explanation is that previous experiences and observations entered into or gathered themselves about his religious sentiment determining how it would react when some event would cause these hidden thoughts to crystalize. In this case the event which caused their crystallization was probably a feast in Samaria. To regard the utterances as Yahweh's message to the people, it is not necessary to say they were obtained in an ecstatic trance. Povah[1] says that the prophets sometimes spoke under ecstacy. That may be true, but such ecstatic utterances are scarcely to be found in Amos. A comparison of his visions with those of Ezekiel, which are obviously more of the ecstatic type, will indicate the rationality of Amos' visions. The careful literary form in which they are given also bears this out. Thus one may say that even the small element of magic usually present in the ecstatic vision was missing in Amos.

In his opposition to idols[2] and even more so in his opposition to the immorality of the high places Amos was indirectly, but violently, opposing magic. To offer sacrifices at the shrines was only to pile sin upon sin.[3] These piled up sins would eventually result in the most

(1) Povah "N. Psych. and Heb. Prophets." p. 102
(2) Amos 526
(3) Amos. 4:4-5

terrible consquence imaginable.[1] The people did not mistreat the poor on the Sabbath or on feast days, but the only reason for their refraining from doing so was the fear lest they overstep a ritualistic command.[2] Such sacrifices, however, were of no use unless accompanied by justice and honesty.[3] The opposition to the high places was at the same time an opposition to the magical fertility cults, and when the high places were eventually destroyed a large element of magic was also destroyed.

A part of this opposition may also be explained by the fact that Amos himself was a poor man and could thus sympathize with the poor generally. It is a noteworthy fact that the criticism of the rich usually comes from the poorer classes. By this is not meant that Amos was prompted by selfish motives but it does help explain how he arrived at the messages he uttered.

Although magic is not directly mentioned in his writings, it has no place in his thinking. Yahweh cannot be forced to give an oracle but oracles are dependent upon moral behavior.[4] Yahweh demands justice, equity, and honesty.[5] The truly religious method of obtaining Yahweh's favor is by means of obedience to his moral requirements and by prayer.[6] No doubt Amos often wished Israel would give up sacrificing and would learn to pray and to live a just and pure life.

(1) Amos 5:7 ff.
(2) Amos 8:4 f.
(3) Amos 5:21-24
(4) Amos 8:11
(5) O. and R. Heb. Rel. p.205
(6) Amos. 7:2-3

In the writings of Hosea we find a much more direct and emphatic condemnation of magic. The chief factor in his religious sentiment was the sex instinct or love. There are several reasons for this. The sexual metaphor used in describing the relationship between the worshipper and the deity was only too common in the ancient east.(1) It was used in two ways, as a picture of a wife and her husband and as a picture of a child and its father. Again the prevalent magical fertility cults practised upon the high places with their sexual immorality were violently opposed by the prophets because of moral reasons. It would be impossible to speak of them without the use of sexual terms.

The third and the most important reason for the predominence of the idea of love in Hosea's religious sentiment is his own domestic experience. The generally accepted interpretation of this phase of his writings is somewhat as follows: The marriage of Hosea and Gomer was at first a sincere love match. They lived together for a time and were faithful to one another. Then after the birth of their first child Gomer became unfaithful and began to keep company with other men. Hosea speaks as though the second and third children, born while Gomer was still with him, were illegitimate. Then, because Gomer had not been able to sublimate her very strong sex

(1) O. and R. Heb. Rel. pp. 206, 207

instinct, she went from bad to worse till finally she had left Hosea and found herself being sold as a slave. When Hosea heard of this he found he still loved her in spite of her sin, and bought her at the slave market. He brought her home and first put her to a test to determine whether or not she had repented, after which he again took her to himself as his wife.

When Hosea realized that he still loved Gomer it also dawned upon him that in a similar way Yahweh still loved Israel, though the latter was still living a life of shame. He saw also that as Gomer's sex instinct began and ended in the purely physical it was purely external and was also purely selfish.(1) Hosea opposed this externalism and searched for the inner springs of action.(2) The cults of the time grossly misrepresented God because the people did not understand him just as Gomer did not truly know Hosea.

When Hosea brought Gomer home again he told her "For many a day you must remain mine, you must not play the harlot, you must have nothing to do with a man--and I will have nothing to do with you."(3) The giving up of her harlotry and of her paramours was to be permanent but after many a day she was again to be his wife. Similarly, Israel was to leave forever her sacrifices on the heights,

(1) J.W. Povah. N. Psych. and Heb. Prophets.
(2) O. and R. Heb. Rel. p. 207
(3) Hosea 3:3

her sacred stones, her ephod and oracle, but after many a day she was again to return to God and have a Davidic king. But never again must she return to such physical and external things mentioned above. Israel was to live a spiritual life with Yahweh. He would allure her into the desert and there he would speak to her heart, he would "betroth her in a bond of goodness, and of justice, in kindness and in love."(1) What room would there be for externalism and magic in such a religion?

Hosea was a man of intense emotions yet he was able to think clearly. His beliefs were so strongly henotheistic that for all practical purposes they were monotheistic. This gave no space to foreign gods, nor to demons, both of which were regarded as magical. The same is true also of the other prophets.

In Isaiah we have, it seems, a very interesting example of a secondary sentiment taking the place of the primary sentiment, that is, the vanishing of one ideal and the growth of another. Apparently Isaiah was closely connected with the royal house. He regarded King Uzziah as his ideal and thus his dominent sentiment was patriotism. But the king died, and for a while Isaiah was lost. Then he saw the Lord, high and lifted up, he was filled with awe and reverence, and began to work in his cause. The religious sentiment had become his ideal,

(1) Hosea 2:14 and 19

the controling factor in his life, yet the national sentiment was still very strong.

In regard to the eliminating of magic from religion the important teaching in Isaiah is his opposition to necromancy. All higher prophetic teaching was opposed to this practice but Isaiah is the most outspoken.(1) Why did he oppose necromancy? There are perhaps two answers to be given. He regarded Yahweh as awful and majestic, so lofty that nothing earthly could come into contact with him nor be compared with him. But the wizards and mediums spoke or caused the spirits of the dead to "cheep and gibber in low murmurs." Such practice was entirely incompatible with his conception of Yahweh. Again, he says, "Why consult the dead on behalf of the living?" His conception of an after life cannot be described by the word "life." It was a mere existence of the spirit in a shadowy realm. The spirit had no genuine reality and, worst of all, it had no communion with God. It was unfaithfulness to him to ask such a spirit for guidance.

Generally, the conceptions of the prophets were far ahead of their times. The religion of the masses was far behind them and in this case it still tolerated necromancy. One of the sins of Manasseh, who lived half a century later than Isaiah, was the instituting of mediums and wizards.

(1) Isaiah 8:19 ff. 29:4

Micah and Isaiah were contemporaries. Both held a similar conception of Yahweh. He was a holy and righteous God and he alone was to be worshipped. Their background however was quite different, Micah being a man from the country. Like Isaiah he was strenuously opposed to sorcery wizards, idols, sacred stones, in fact anything their hands had made including the Temple at Jerusalem contrary to Isaiah who said the Temple would not be destroyed. He had a high religious ideal but he also had a sentiment of dislike or hatred toward city life. He believed all evils came from the city, which existed only to exploit the country people. Perhaps in his opinion the above mentioned magical practices were carried on in the Temple itself. Many prophets, he calls them false prophets, practised divination and thus led the people astray. This evil was increased by the fact that they divined for money.(1) In Micah's case it is also true that his lofty conceptions of Yahweh made him practically a monotheist and thus he left no room for magical practices.

During the reign of Manasseh in the middle of the seventh century any prophet who dared in any way to oppose the idolatry practised by both king and the people was promptly put to death. The prophets were forced to work secretly, and the result was the book of Deuteronomy. This book may be considered as an attempt to preserve for later

(1) Micah 2:5 ff, 3:5 ff, 3:11

generations the achievements of the eighth century prophets. It sought to codify their teachings and thus set out in clear, unmistakable terms how an individual must live in order to live according to the will of Yahweh. It gave examples which were intended to indicate how love toward man and God should manifest itself. It strictly opposed such practices as necromancy (1) and such low forms of religion as were practised by Israel's neighbors. (2) It laid great stress on the personal relationship in religion. (3) There is a noble prayer in I Kings 8 which is falsely attributed to Solomon. The viewpoint is too exalted even for Israel's so-called wisest king. It is of interest to note that according to verse 35 when rain is desired the people must pray for it. This leaves no room for such rain-makings as that of Elijah. The Book of Deuteronomy is a decline from the highest prophetical truths but the fault lay with the people who interpreted its letter, not its spirit, and thus made it ritualistic. For example, they would leave some of the olives and grapes on the trees and vines for the poor, but they would carefully pick all other fruits because these were not mentioned in Deuteronomy's commands.

Apparently the prophet Jeremiah taught the principles of Deuteronomy for a time but he soon learned that to do

(1) Dt. 18:10-12
(2) II Kings 17:14-17 (The books of Kings are to be considered as part of Deuteronomy being history rewritten from the Deuteronomic point of view.)
(3) Dt. 8:5

so was not only useless, but harmful. He realized that the tendency of the common people was always toward externalism and magic and that this tendency was making Deuteronomy a book of ritualistic practices, rather than a summary of prophetic truths. This realization culminated in his New Covenant which was to be written on the hearts of men.

Jeremiah has many characteristics similar to those of Hosea but he rises to even greater heights. From the terminology employed in his writings one gathers that the chief element in his religious sentiment or ideal is sex, that is, love and tender emotion. But he himself remained unmarried. The physical element did not enter into his thinking, his thoughts were entirely spiritual. Thus it is evident that the love metaphor he used did not come from his own experience. He seems to have borrowed directly from Hosea in several instances. He carried the thought of faithfulness to the limit when he insisted on the purity of the heart or, in more modern terms, the purity of the whole personality. Gregariousness played almost no part with Jeremiah. He was able to conceive of religion continuing without the Temple and its gatherings.

It is not surprising that magic is not mentioned in Jeremiah. Magic is an external practice. The prophet carried his opposition to externalism so far that he even regards the temple as a hindrance to spirituality.(1) He

(1) Jer. 7 and 26. See A.C. Welch, in "Abingdon Commentary." p. 678b.

predicted, as did Micah, the utter destruction of the Temple but his motives were much higher than Micah's. Jeremiah saw that the people placed such emphasis on the Temple itself as to forget whose dwelling place it was meant to be. Jeremiah also regarded dreams as mere formations within the prophets mind.(1) He warned them against uttering "their own illusions" as though they were messages from Yahweh. "If a prophet has had a dream, then let him tell his dream; but he who has a word of mine then let him tell it faithfully." Nothing external was to enter the content of true prophecy.

In Jeremiah's New Covenant(2) the highest point in the religion of the Old Testament is reached. Yahweh asks nothing external, not even a law book nor anyone to teach the law or the commands of God, but all individuals, both the great and the small will have the law written within their hearts. Everyone will faithfully follow the dictates of his own heart which will be entirely in accord with the will of Yahweh. All past sins will be forgiven and the people will live with the Spirit of God within their hearts. This New Covenant is hardly exceeded even in Jesus' teaching. After this high point has been reached there is a marked and rapid decline. Because the people interpreted Deuteronomy as having such ritualistic significance this decline may be regarded as beginning

(1) Jer. 23:27 ff. and 29:8
(2) Jer. 31:31-34

with this book for which the prophetic authors had such high hopes. The decline continued in Ezekiel and became most marked in the later writings both priestly and prophetic. There is, however, one outstanding exception, that of chapters 40 to 55 Isaiah, written toward the end of the exile. They contain a conception of religion surpassing, in part, even that of Jeremiah. Yahweh was to be the God of the nations and Israel was to be his missionary, proclaiming and demonstrating true religion (משפט-Mishpat) to all the world.(1) These chapters severly oppose the worship of idols even mocking them as mere handmade objects. They are utterly worthless. The author of Isaiah 40 to 55 did not fail to appreciate Jeremiah as Ezekiel failed to do. Jeremiah was the pioneer of the idea of individual responsibility, Ezekiel merely borrowed from him and amplified what he had borrowed, but the great prophet of the exile rose to noble conceptions of personal and spiritual religion.

(1) Isaiah 42:1-7
(2) Isaiah 41:28 and 44:9-20

MAGIC AND RELIGION DURING THE EXILIC AND POST-EXILIC PERIODS

It does not come as a surprise to find in the prophet Ezekiel a much greater amount of externalism and magic than was found in Jeremiah and his predecessors. There are several reasons for this. Ezekiel was a member of the priestly family (1) which had officiated at the temple ever since it had been built and would naturally lay stress on ritual. Even though Judah was in captivity and the temple lay in ruins he regarded this as only temporary and Yahweh would again restore them to Jerusalem. Without a people Yahweh could not exist as a living God. In describing the restoration Ezekiel pictures a glorious temple and an elaborate ritual complete in every detail. It is, however, not true that he transformed the ideals of the prophets into rules and dogmas, and destroyed spiritually free and moral religion. "His age required the expression of religious ideals in external, concrete forms. The great mass of the people still needed the temple, the sacrificial systems and other institutions as means of communion with God, and it is exceedingly doubtful that the religion of Jehovah could have survived without them. That later generations exaggerated the importance of externals until finally the spirit was altogether lost

(1) Ezekiel 1:3

sight of was not the fault of Ezekiel. The ritual does by no means exhaust the religious interests of the prophet. Again and again he insists that a pure and righteous life is an essential part of true religion."[1] Yet, regardless of Ezekiel's motives, his codification of ideals and stress on externalism furthered the regression of religion towards magic.

Some have held Ezekiel to have been a cataleptic but that is now generally not accepted. But "he was certainly psychic, subject to trance and ecstasy,[2] and gifted with second sight.[3] Many of his prophecies were given in the form of symbolic actions, and it seems to be certain that these were actually performed. Such actions in Semitic thought are more than mere symbols; they are 'sympathetic magic,' tending to produce the results of which they are symbolic."[4] On the other hand J.M.P. Smith says that many of these symbolic actions were not actually performed but took place in a trance.[5]

Still a third factor which accelerated the downward movement of religion was Ezekiel's environment. Isaiah, chapter 47, contains a vivid description of Babylon's magical practices employing spells and mighty magic, magic craft and cunning, astrologers, star-gazers and calculation of the future, month by month. Naturally all this

(1) W.L. Wardle. Abingdon Commentary p. 715
(2) Ezekiel 8:1f, 11:1f, 24:1f, 33:1f, 37:1f.
(3) Ezekiel, 8:16, 11:13, 24:1
(4) Wardle, Ab. Com. p. 714
(5) "Prophets and their Times," pp. 162, 163

influenced Ezekiel. One must take into account the prophets inheritance, temperament and environment in forming an opinion of him, and doing so one is able to understand and appreciate the prophet's constructive work.

The priestly codes and documents contain much that is magical. In Exodus 7:8-13, a part of the "P" document, Moses and Aaron are given the power of rhabdomancy, whereby they could change their rods into reptiles, to prove their authenticity. The rhabdomancy here is not only tolerated but advocated, commanded by Yahweh. The Egyptian magicians could do the same but their's were mere clever tricks, but Aaron's magic was more potent and his rod swallowed up the Egyptian rods. This is a document written about 500 B.C., two centuries after the great prophets.

Numbers 5, a part of the "P" document, contains an illuminating bit of ritualistic magic employed by the priest to determine whether a woman had been unfaithful to her husband. If a man had only a fit of suspicion he could bring his wife, together with a cereal-offering, to the priest. The priest placed her in front of Yahweh, dropped some dust from the floor into holy water, then after a conditional curse was written and the writing washed down into the water the woman was made to drink it. If she was guilty the water would cause her thighs to shrivel and her belly to swell; if innocent no harm would follow.

The priestly writings placed great stress on the use

of phylacteries and fringes, or more correctly, tassels. These are mentioned in earlier writings,[1] but the most detailed descriptions as to their construction and use are to be found in "P". The practice of wearing phylacteries is justified by a passage in Deuteronomy 6:8 which says "You must tie them on your hands as a memento, and wear them on your forehead as a badge." Originally, they were not regarded as magical but their close resemblance to such amulets as were tolerated in Israel soon made the phylacteries take on magical significance. It is evident that amulets were employed as prophylactics, i.e. as a means of counterworking the evil influence of witchcraft and demons. Some Jewish amulets consisted of inscribed objects bound up in leather cases. It was believed that the "Shema"[2] were words containing special powers.[3] Considering this together with the fact that phylacteries consisted of small leather cases containing inscribed bits of parchment, one of these being the "Shema", it is impossible to escape the conclusion that these were, at least by the masses, considered as magical. The priestly writings prescribed their use. The tendency to regard the ritual commanded in "P" as magical is increased by the fact that, unlike "D", "P" gives no reasons for obeying the rites, except perhaps the phrase, "because Yahweh is

(1) Dt. 22:12
(2) Deut. 6:4-9 and 11:13-21
(3) Whitehouse, Hasting's Vol. IV, p. 604

holy."

The magical content of tassels is also evident. A.R.S. Kennedy[1] says, "When we attempt to go behind the prescription of the Torah there is reason to believe that we have here an ancient custom, (the practice of wearing tassels was known to the ancient Persians as appears from the monuments of Persepolis) perhaps with originally magical or superstitious associations, taken up and impressed with a new significance by the Hebrew legislation." That the people regarded them as magically potent is seen in the N.T. account of the woman with the hemorrage being cured by touching the tassel of Jesus' robe.[2]

The prophets' opposition toward idols and necromancy is carried on also in the priestly writings. They will permit no other gods nor idols to be worshipped. Yahweh alone must be worshipped by the Jews. Necromancy was also severly denounced. Leviticus[3] says wizards and mediums are not to be consulted because such consultation is deserting Yahweh. Also "any man or woman who is a medium or a wizard must be put to death." Chronicles, which was written from the priestly point of view, says Saul was slain on the battle field because he consulted a medium.[4]

Judaism had been purged but little of magic. Even

(1) Hastings Vol. II, p. 69a
(2) Lk. 8:44
(3) Lev. 19:31, 20:6 and 27
(4) I Chron. 10:13-14

the post-exilic prophets tend toward externalism. Haggai and Zechariah advocate the rebuilding of the temple in order to obtain material prosperity. Malachi says all the hardships of the returned exiles have come upon them because they offer blemished animals at sacrifices. Very little is said about spiritual relationship to Yahweh.

The writer of Daniel as late as 165 B.C. says that Daniel and his companions were ten times better than all the magicians and enchanters of Babylon. The status of magic in Judea may best be described by quoting O.C. Whitehouse.(1)

"As a matter of fact, however, the mass of the people could not be delivered from the influences of their time, and troubled themselves little about the religious scruples of their teachers, and----were delivered up to the superstitious tendencies and practices of their age. Hence the Mishna (Sota 1 x 13) deplores that jealousy and magic were ruining society. Indeed we even hear of distinguished Rabbis practising magic, e.g. Eliezer, son of Hyrcanus, who at the request of Akiba was able, through a charm, to fill an entire field with gourds, and by means of another formula to transfer them to a single place (Sanhedrin 68a in Blau, p. 26). Jesus Christ was regarded by His countrymen as a magician, and was called by them Bal'am (Sank. 106b, Sota 47b.). According to the Gospel

(1) Hasting's, Vol. III p. 211a.

narrative (Mt. 12:24 f.), He was even called a sorcerer who worked His wonders in league with Beelzebub. Tobit, Ch. 6, clearly illustrates how thoroughly demonology and magic practices had taken hold of the Jewish people."

On the whole, the eighth century prophets would have regarded the post-exilic period as one of apostasy. Few fruits of their labors were to be seen, due perhaps to the severity of the times and the human tendency to travel the easier and more pleasant road of ceremonialism. Not until several centuries later were their teachings and ideals, in part, realized. Even today religion may profit by studying the words of these great and godly men.

B29744